

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Notice of Non-Compliance Amendment dated April 21, 2005 which states that the amendment filed on April 11, 2005 is non-compliant because "claim 10 shows amending".

The amendment shows that the status identifier for claim 10 has been changed from previously presented to "currently amended". The application is now in proper form for entry.

The Office Action mailed January 7, 2005 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claim 11 has been added. Claim 8 has been redrafted into independent form. Claims 1-11 are pending, the independent claims being 1, 4, 8 and 10. Claims 4, 7, 8 and 10 are amended. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

The objection to claims 7-9 for improper form is believed to have been overcome by amendment.

Claims 1-6 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,549,627 to Rasmusson et al. ("Rasmusson").

Claim 1 recites, "for each of the input signals an individual processing history of adaptive echo cancelling data is kept and combined with current adaptive beamforming data."

The Office Action cites FIGs. 5 and 6. FIG. 6 features a fixed beamformer (see FIG. 6), rather than an adaptive beamformer (see also, col. 6, lines 1 and 24-29).

Likewise, the input signals to microphones 405, 407 in FIG. 5 are among said "each of the input signals," at least because the input signals to microphones 405, 407 in FIG. 5 are different and distinct from the input signals to microphones 405, 407 in FIG. 4 (col. 4, lines 24-25; col. 5, lines 8 and 9).

However, the FIG. 5 signals are, at best, subject merely to fixed echo canceling (FIG. 5, ref. nos. 413, 415).

For at least this reason, the cited reference fails to anticipate the present invention as recited in claim 1.

Claim 4, as amended, recites, "the beamformer and canceller being configured for simultaneously adaptive operation." Support for the amendment of claim 4 is found in the specification (e.g., page 1, line 22; page 6, lines 7-8). FIGs. 4 and 5 of the cited reference, by contrast, constitute two temporally separate steps of a process.

Claim 8 continues to recite, "the adaptive filter comprises a first section for calculating at least one loudspeaker input spectrum and a part of normalized update data, and a second section for performing convolution and calculating echo cancelling coefficient update data."

The cited reference fails to disclose or suggest this feature of claim 8, and the Office Action, and the prior Office Action, do not say otherwise.

Claim 10 has been amended to include the same language added to claim 4, and is likewise deemed to be patentable over the cited reference.

Each of the other rejected claims, each depends from a respective base claim and is deemed to distinguish patentably over the cited reference for at least the same reason(s) set forth above with regard to the base claim.

Claim 11 is similar to the language added to claims 4 and 8, and is also regarded as patentable.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

In the event that there are any difficulties regarding this matter, it is requested that the undersigned be contacted at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Gregory L. Thorne, Reg. 39,398
Senior Corporate Patent Counsel
(914) 333-9665

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited this date with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On May 9, 2005
By Natalie A. Mange